

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Reply is being filed in response to the final Official Action of June 22, 2006. The final Official Action no longer rejects Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, alleging that the claimed invention is indefinite since characterizing findings as strengths or weaknesses in purely subjective. Nonetheless, the final Official Action continues to reject Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the publication Susann Wilkinson, *Evaluation Report for Grant #R13 HG00793-0142: Impact of Human Genome Initiative on Society: A Women's Study Approach* (hereinafter "Wilkinson"). As explained below, however, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is patentably distinct from Wilkinson. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the claims. In view of the remarks presented herein, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the present application. Alternatively, as the remarks presented herein do not raise any new issues or introduce any new matter, Applicant respectfully requests entry of this correspondence for purposes of narrowing the issues upon appeal.

Again, Wilkinson discloses a participant evaluation of a workshop entitled "Women and Genetics in Contemporary Society" (WAGICS). As disclosed, the workshop was evaluated in a number of areas including participant background and expectations, pre- and post-workshop agreement with workshop goals, principles and procedures, assessment of the workshop's individual sessions and the alternative communication techniques, participants' post-workshop commentary and reflection. The evaluation data was collected via pre-and post-workshop participant questionnaires, on-site observations compiled on assessment sheets, and alternative communication techniques such as a suggestion/comment box. In one of the questionnaires, for example, a grid was presented on which participants indicated their agreement or disagreement with the process of organizing the meeting, and the theoretical principles that guided the co-principal investigators and the planning committee responsible for organizing the meeting.

A. Claims 1-14 are Patentable over Wilkinson

According to one aspect of the claimed invention, as embodied in independent Claim 1 and similarly independent Claims 7 and 15, a method for assessing a process of an organization

includes acquiring information concerning the organization and the process. A plurality of preliminary findings (see, e.g., FIG. 4, reference 26) is then developed based upon the information, where each preliminary finding is characterized as a strength or weakness (see, e.g., FIG. 4, reference 30). Next, an electronic vote for agreement or disagreement with each preliminary finding is taken (see, e.g., FIG. 4, reference 32), or as recited in independent Claim 15, an electronic vote of agreement or disagreement with the characterization of each of the preliminary findings is then taken (see, e.g., FIG. 4, reference 34). Thereafter, a plurality of final findings is developed, where each final finding is similarly characterized as a strength or weakness. In this regard, the plurality of final findings is based upon the vote for the conclusion (or valuation in amended independent Claim 15) associated with each preliminary finding.

In contrast to independent Claim 1, and similarly independent Claim 7, Wilkinson does not teach or suggest assessing a process of an organization according to a method that includes (a) developing preliminary findings based upon information concerning the organization and the process, where each finding is characterized as either a strength or weakness; (b) electronically voting for agreement or disagreement with each finding (or with the characterization of each finding); and then (c) developing final findings based upon the vote, where the final findings, like the preliminary findings, are each characterized as a strength or weakness (i.e., each final finding includes the characterization).

The Official Action appears to concede that Wilkinson does not explicitly disclose preliminary or final findings having associated strength or weakness characterizations. Nonetheless, the Official Action alleges that this feature is inherent in Wilkinson since such characterizations are subjective and that, while the theoretical principles presented to the participants for agreement voting mostly include strengths, one or more of those principles may be viewed by some as weaknesses. To the contrary, however, even if the principles disclosed by Wilkinson could have associated strength/weakness characterizations, this does not establish inherency of such characterizations in Wilkinson. Rather, establishing inherency of the aforementioned feature requires evidence establishing that principles necessarily do include such characterizations, as opposed to a probability or possibility of including those characterizations.

In response to the foregoing, the final Official Action maintains that Wilkinson does inherently disclose strength/weakness characterizations of the principles presented to the participants for agreement. Nonetheless, the Official Action still fails to establish this inherency. As disclosed in the MPEP, the Examiner bears the burden of establishing inherency in the prior art. More particularly, as explained in the MPEP, “In relying upon the theory of inherency, the examiner must provide a basis in fact and/or in technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that the allegedly inherent characteristic necessarily flows from the teachings of the applied prior art.” MPEP § 2112 (*quoting Ex parte Levy*, 17 USPQ2d 1461, 1464 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990) (emphasis in original)).

In the instant case, the Examiner has failed to provide any facts or technical reasoning to support her conclusion that Wilkinson inherently discloses the aforementioned strength/weakness characterizations. The Examiner does allege that most of the principles are characterized as inherent strengths. But not only does the Examiner fail to provide facts or technical reasoning for her conclusion that most of the principles are inherently characterized as strengths, but her allegation does not support that the principles inherently include strength/weakness characterizations in the first place. In fact, in the only substantive attempt to provide such reasoning to support the inherency of characterizations, proffered in the second Official Action (see page 3), the Examiner’s explanation clearly demonstrated that the principles of Wilkinson do not necessarily, and thus inherently, include associated strength/weakness characterizations, similar to the claimed invention.

In contrast to the allegation of the Official Action, Applicant respectfully submits that nothing in Wilkinson teaches or suggests, explicitly or inherently, that the items of the participant questionnaires are characterized as strengths or weaknesses (i.e., have associated characterizations selected from a group consisting of a strength or a weakness), as recited by the claimed invention. As is well understood by those skilled in the art, characterizations such as those recited by the claimed invention may be considered traits, qualities or properties that at least partially distinguish respective entities from one another. *See Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, Characteristic* (visited Feb. 27, 2006) <<http://www.m-w.com/dictionary/characteristic>> (explaining that characteristics may be defined as

distinguishing traits, qualities or properties). In accordance with the claimed invention, then, the recited characterizations at least partially distinguish the findings from one another. Nothing in Wilkinson, however, teaches or suggests that the items of a questionnaire have associated traits, qualities or properties that serve to distinguish the items from one another, much less in any manner that could reasonably be interpreted to correspond to a strength or a weakness.

Applicant therefore respectfully submits that independent Claim 1, and similarly independent Claim 7, is patentably distinct from Wilkinson. And as dependent Claims 2-6 and 8-14 include all the limitations of respective ones of independent Claims 1 and 7, dependent Claims 2-6 and 8-14 are also patentably distinct from Wilkinson for at least the reasons given above. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that various ones of dependent Claims 2-6, 8-14 and 16-20 recite features further patentably distinct from Wilkinson. For example, dependent Claim 6, and similarly dependent Claim 12, further recites voting for agreement or disagreement with the characterization (strength or weakness) of each preliminary finding (i.e., voting for a valuation), and developing final findings further based upon the aforementioned voting step. As explained above, Wilkinson does not teach or suggest, explicitly or inherently, preliminary or final findings having associated strength or weakness characterizations. Thus, Wilkinson also does not teach or suggest, explicitly or inherently, voting for agreement or disagreement with those characterizations. Moreover, even if one could argue (albeit incorrectly) that Wilkinson inherently discloses that the questionnaire items are inherently characterized as strengths or weaknesses by virtue of the subjective nature of such a characterization, Wilkinson still does not teach or suggest voting for agreement or disagreement with the characterization of findings as strengths or weaknesses, as recited by dependent Claims 6 and 12.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-14 are patentably distinct from Wilkinson, and that the rejection of those claims as being unpatentable over Wilkinson is overcome.

B. Claims 15-20 are Patentable over Wilkinson

Similar to independent Claim 1, independent Claim 15 recites a method for developing at least one assessment of a process of an organization, where each of the at least one assessments

has an associated characterization selected from a group consisting of a strength and a weakness. Also similar to independent Claim 1, independent Claim 15 recites acquiring information concerning the organization and the process, and developing a plurality of preliminary findings based upon the information, where each preliminary finding has an associated characterization. In addition, similar to dependent Claim 6, independent Claim 15 recites voting for a valuation associated with each preliminary finding, where the valuation is selected from a group consisting of an agreement with the characterization of the preliminary finding and a disagreement with the characterization of the preliminary finding. Further, independent Claim 15 recites developing the assessment(s), where each assessment has an associated characterization based upon the voting for the valuation associated with each preliminary finding.

In contrast to independent Claim 15, Wilkinson does not teach or suggest assessing a process of an organization according to a method that includes developing preliminary findings based upon information concerning the organization and the process, where each finding is characterized as either a strength or weakness, as explained above with respect to independent Claim 1. Also in contrast to independent Claim 15, Wilkinson does not teach or suggest voting for agreement or disagreement with strength or weakness characterizations of the preliminary findings, as explained above with respect to dependent Claim 6. Thus, for at least the same reasons given above with respect to independent Claims 1 and 6, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claim 15, and by dependency Claims 16-20, is also patentably distinct from Wilkinson. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Claims 15-20 as being unpatentable over Wilkinson is overcome.

Appl. No.: 09/848,519
Amdt. dated 08/09/2006
Reply to Official Action of June 22, 2006

CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks presented above, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. As such, the issuance of a Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested. In order to expedite the examination of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney in order to resolve any remaining issues. As explained above, no new matter or issues are raised by this Reply, and as such, Applicant alternatively respectfully requests entry of this Reply for purposes of narrowing the issues upon appeal.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,



Andrew T. Spence
Registration No. 45,699

Customer No. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON August 9, 2006.

LEGAL01/I3012375v1